UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE
52nd meeting
held on
Monday, 6 December 1993
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 52nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KUKAN (Slovakia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 114: HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued)*

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS INSTRUMENTS (continued)

(b) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS, INCLUDING ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS (continued)

(c) HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATIONS AND REPORTS OF SPECIAL RAPPORTEURS AND REPRESENTATIVES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 115: SITUATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN ESTONIA AND LATVIA (continued)*

AGENDA ITEM 172: NECESSITY OF ADOPTING EFFECTIVE MEASURES FOR THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN THROUGHOUT THE WORLD WHO ARE VICTIMS OF ESPECIALLY DIFFICULT CIRCUMSTANCES, INCLUDING ARMED CONFLICTS (continued)*

* Items considered together.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/48/SR.52
7 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

93-82867 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 114: HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued)

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS INSTRUMENTS (continued) (A/C.3/48/L.53, L.61 and L.67)

(b) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS, INCLUDING ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS (continued) (A/C.3/48/L.38, L.42-L.50, L.52, L.54-L.56, L.59, L.60, L.63, L.64, L.66, L.69, L.71, L.76, L.77, L.79 and L.80)

(c) HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATIONS AND REPORTS OF SPECIAL RAPPORTEURS AND REPRESENTATIVES (continued) (A/C.3/48/L.36/Rev.1, L.51/Rev.1, L.57, L.58, L.62, L.65, L.68, L.70 and L.72-L.74/Rev.1, L.75 and L.81)

AGENDA ITEM 115: SITUATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN ESTONIA AND LATVIA (continued) (A/C.3/48/L.37/Rev.1 and L.78)

AGENDA ITEM 172: NECESSITY OF ADOPTING EFFECTIVE MEASURES FOR THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN THROUGHOUT THE WORLD WHO ARE VICTIMS OF ESPECIALLY DIFFICULT CIRCUMSTANCES, INCLUDING ARMED CONFLICTS (continued) (A/C.3/48/L.39/Rev.1, L.40 and L.82)

Statements in exercise of the right of reply

1. Ms. FERTEKLİGİL (Turkey) said that, in its statement at the previous meeting, the Greek Government had made its usual allegations against Turkey with regard to the question of Cyprus. The Third Committee was not the appropriate forum for discussing that political issue; however, her Government had to respond to what it considered as a distortion of the basic issues.

2. In 1963, three years after the Republic of Cyprus had been established, Greece had incited the Greek Cypriots to start a civil war in an attempt to destroy the constitutional order, massacre the Turkish population and divide the island. There had been unrestrained violations of the human rights of the Turkish Cypriots, including their right to life. The former Prime Minister of Greece, in his book Democracy at Gunpoint, recalled that in 1964 Greece had clandestinely sent an army of 20,000 soldiers to Cyprus with a view to annexing it. In that same year, the United Nations had sent peace-keeping forces to Cyprus to save the Turkish Cypriots from extermination. Those forces were still there and Greece was largely responsible for that. In July 1974, Greece had decided to pursue a final solution, namely, the annexation of Cyprus to Greece by means of a coup d'état. That plan had failed owing to the intervention of Turkey, acting as a guarantor under international treaties.

3. Greece had never taken any steps towards reconciling the two Cypriot populations. In fact, it had always supported the most nationalistic and extreme Greek Cypriot groups as they waged their unceasing campaign of hostility against the Turkish Cypriots. Her delegation regretted that Greece had

(Ms. Fertekligil, Turkey)

continued to use the same fruitless rhetoric for 30 years. Moreover, the provocative actions of the new Greek Government and the poorly-timed statements of its members were ominous signs.

4. If Greece sincerely wished to settle the Cyprus question, it would have to change its attitude drastically. It must accept that Cyprus was not a Greek island but the common homeland of Turkish and Greek Cypriots. It must give up its threatening attitude of confrontation, follow the voice of reason, and stop encouraging Greek Cypriot adventurism.

5. Turkey would continue to play its constructive role in promoting negotiations to arrive at a just and sustainable solution through the good offices of the Secretary-General.

6. Mr. KASOULIDES (Cyprus) said that it was a pleasure to hear the representative of Turkey exercising her right of reply for the first time during the current session. That was far better than circulating replies in the form of letters prepared by the illegal entity in the north of Cyprus, a practice which was an abuse of the privileges of a Member State and a waste of resources and which set a destructive precedent. He urged Turkey to put an end to that practice.

7. During the discussions in the Third Committee, he had been astonished to hear Turkey calling for the preservation of the territorial integrity of sovereign States, condemning other States as aggressors, protesting the violation of human rights in a particular country and calling for the implementation of United Nations resolutions. Paragraph 3 of Security Council resolution 550 (1984) called upon all States not to recognize the purported State of the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus", set up by secessionist acts and called upon them not to facilitate or in any way assist the aforesaid secessionist entity. Yet, nearly 10 years later, while refusing to abide by United Nations resolutions concerning Cyprus, Turkey was urging other States to implement them.

8. It was simple to distort history, as the representative of Turkey had just done. In 1965, the United Nations had warned that Turkey had been intentionally using disturbances on Cyprus to separate the two communities and annex Cyprus. Almost 30 years later, and with more than half of the island's population uprooted, Turkey was bringing Greek Cypriot atrocities to the attention of the Committee. That was surely a supreme irony.

9. The aggressor's strategy was to ridicule the victim's statements and hope that the international community would grow weary of the entire issue. But the international community did not forget blatant violations of the code of civilized behaviour. The Secretary-General had recently observed that the status quo in Cyprus, which the Security Council had deemed unacceptable, had been established through the use of force, was sustained by military strength, and was not viable in the long term. Turkey should not assume that the international community would, in time, tire of its struggle for justice and freedom.

10. Mr. VASSILAKIS (Greece) said that, in its statement at the previous meeting, his Government had presented only indisputable facts and for that reason the Turkish Government had not refuted them. In its comments on the policy of the Greek Government, Turkey had misquoted his Government or taken its statements out of context. Greece had repeatedly expressed its willingness to cooperate on the basis of universally accepted principles of respect for human rights and the withdrawal of the Turkish occupation troops from Cyprus. He reiterated his appeal to Turkey to review its policy in the light of friendly relations between neighbours.

11. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its general discussion on items 114, 115 and 172.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.36/Rev.1

12. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.36/Rev.1, entitled "Situation of human rights in Cuba", and said that it had no programme budget implications. He noted that a recorded vote had been requested.

Statements in explanation of vote before the voting

13. Mr. FERNÁNDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) said that the vote to be taken on draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.36/Rev.1 would conclude a new chapter in the sad history of the unfair and arbitrary attempts of the Government of the United States to indict Cuba. The United States authorities had used manipulation and pressure which had led to the appointment of a Special Rapporteur for Cuba and the adoption of resolutions critical of his country in both the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights.

14. All delegations, including those which had sponsored the draft resolution and those which would vote in favour of it, were aware of the arbitrary acts that had brought the situation to its current stage. Everyone knew that the so-called human rights situation in Cuba was part of the campaign of aggression that the Government of the United States had been waging for decades for the purpose of achieving, through external strangulation and subversion of the institutional order, the end of Cuba as an independent country.

15. The facts spoke for themselves. The Special Rapporteur's interim report (A/48/562) clearly showed the unfairness of applying such discriminatory measures to Cuba. The Special Rapporteur had not been able to demonstrate massive and flagrant violations of human rights in Cuba and, in an attempt to justify his mandate, had turned to questioning Cuba's legitimate political and legal structure.

16. It was appalling that the United Nations, in spite of its Charter, continued to endorse such flagrant manipulation of a sovereign Member State. It was a disgrace that the Third Committee did not firmly condemn the United States Government's policy of aggression against Cuba and, in particular, its economic,

(Mr. Fernández Palacios, Cuba)

commercial and financial blockade, which had caused great suffering. That policy was clearly a massive and flagrant violation of human rights. It could only diminish the Organization's credibility. It also sent an ambiguous message to the United States, encouraging it to continue its abusive policy, and served to increase opposition to the intolerable practice followed by some States of turning the United Nations into an instrument of their foreign policy.

17. The Committee should refuse to adopt the draft resolution, as it would with any other draft resolution which endorsed discriminatory treatment.

18. Regardless of the outcome of the vote, his country would continue to cooperate with the United Nations in the area of human rights through the use of non-discriminatory mechanisms. It would continue its struggle for the welfare of mankind, for an improved standard of living for its own people and for the full dignity of man.

19. Ms. AL-HAMAMI (Yemen) said that draft resolutions dealing with the situation of human rights in specific countries served the interests of some countries at the expense of others.

20. Yemen's foreign policy reflected its domestic policy, under which the population enjoyed the full range of human rights. It accordingly denounced all violations of human rights wherever they occurred. Nevertheless, the question of human rights had in certain cases been politicized in order to serve the purposes of some countries. Dealing with those issues in a selective manner was contrary to the principle of respect for human rights.

21. For those reasons, her delegation would abstain on any draft resolution referring to the human rights situation in specific countries, with the exception of texts adopted by consensus.

22. Mr. SREENIVASAN (India) said that the recent World Conference on Human Rights had marked a new era of cooperation in the field of human rights. The Conference participants had engaged in a search for solutions rather than in fault-finding. As a result, they had been able to reach consensus not only on a philosophy of human rights but also on a programme of action.

23. Against that background, it might be asked whether it was fair to single out certain countries for their alleged omissions or acts in the area of human rights. In his view, the international community should strive to assist rather than accuse and to counsel rather than condemn countries which, for whatever reason, had difficulties guaranteeing the full enjoyment of human rights.

24. The international community should certainly not turn a blind eye to violations of human rights; he was convinced that it would act by consensus when faced by serious violations. However, there were cases where opinions were divided and where both sides failed to receive equal attention. When several

(Mr. Sreenivasan, India)

countries joined together to criticize another country on its human rights record, the issue moved into the political realm. His own country had been the victim in 1993 of cynical attempts to question its human rights record in order to serve the political purposes of another country.

25. His country could only endorse draft resolutions concerning human rights violations in a specific country when such resolutions were based on consensus. Unless the entire international community was convinced that a draft resolution of that nature was warranted, his country did not want to associate itself with such an action.

26. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ghana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Namibia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guyana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands,

Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, Venezuela.

27. The draft resolution was adopted by 62 votes to 18, with 52 abstentions.*

28. Mr. SERGIWA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), speaking in explanation of vote, said that human rights issues should be dealt with through constructive dialogue rather than being used as political instruments. In view of the politicization of the draft resolution just adopted, and since there were no massive violations of human rights in Cuba, his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. His country was, of course, opposed to human rights violations, and supported the international community's efforts to strengthen respect for human rights. However, those efforts must be carried out in an impartial manner.

29. Mr. BLACKMAN (Barbados) said that, since its independence, his country had zealously guarded its democratic institutions and principles, which included strict respect for human rights. It strictly adhered to the principle of the rule of law, was fully committed to the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and firmly opposed all violations of human rights.

30. Barbados endorsed the principles of the universality and indivisibility of human rights and the interdependence between democracy, development and human rights. It therefore welcomed the reaffirmation of those principles in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, which underscored the importance of all human rights. In that connection, his country considered it essential for human rights to be promoted and protected in a comprehensive, objective and non-selective manner. No right or set of rights should be given priority over any other.

31. The draft resolution just adopted was not a balanced text, and did not fully reflect the conclusions of the Special Rapporteur. The text gave priority to civil and political rights and ignored social, economic and cultural rights. The historical context also made the issue treated in the draft resolution difficult to resolve. His delegation had accordingly abstained in the voting.

32. Mr. MAZLAN (Malaysia) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. While presenting concerns about the situation of human rights in Cuba, the Special Rapporteur's report had also indicated that there had been several positive developments. Although the report had suggested ways to improve the human rights situation in Cuba, the draft resolution completely ignored those suggestions, resulting in an unbalanced and unfair text.

---

* The delegations of Liechtenstein and Andorra subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted against; and the delegations of the Philippines and the Bahamas, that they had intended to abstain.

33. Mr. ANDRIAKA (Ukraine) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting. It recognized Cuba's achievements in the areas of economic, social and cultural rights, which were interrelated with civil and political rights. The blockade against Cuba also influenced the human rights situation.

34. He fully shared the Special Rapporteurs view that the most constructive way to improve the human rights situation in Cuba would be to eliminate as rapidly as possible the vestiges of the cold war as they related to Cuba, while endeavouring to help it return to the regional and world system of cooperation and peaceful settlement of conflict. According to the Special Rapporteur, a few tentative steps had been taken towards increasing confidence between Cuba and its neighbours, which might have a positive impact on human rights.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.39/Rev.1

35. The CHAIRMAN, drawing attention to draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Need to adopt efficient international measures for the prevention of the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography", said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

36. Ms. MURUGESAN (India) said that her country wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

37. The draft resolution was adopted.

38. Ms. FOSTIER (Belgium), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of the European Union, said that the Union fully endorsed the philosophy and general orientation of the draft resolution, which would help to strengthen the system for protecting children who were victims of abhorrent practices. In that connection, the Vienna Declaration and Plan of Action had suggested measures that might be taken to guarantee the rights of children and to ensure to them their rightful place in society.

39. The European Union found it difficult to endorse the contents of paragraph 6, which dealt with a possible draft convention. The Convention on the Rights of the Child, which had already been ratified by a considerable number of countries, could provide States with guidelines for the enactment of legislative measures and the elaboration of policy. Governments should devote their energies to implementing the Convention at the national and international levels rather than embarking on the complex process of elaborating a new convention. The Union was in favour of increasing coordination among the United Nations bodies dealing with human rights, and recalled the guiding principles concerning the elaboration of new instruments set forth in General Assembly resolution 41/120. The Union also had reservations with regard to paragraph 9 of the draft resolution.

40. Mr. KESSEL (Canada) said that, while it strongly supported the thrust of the draft resolution, his country had some concerns regarding paragraph 6. In its view, adequate legal norms already existed in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Programme of Action for the Prevention of the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography.

41. Mr. KUEHL (United States of America) said that his Government fully supported measures to protect and promote the rights of children, including the right to life and the right to be protected from slavery, prostitution and purveyors of child pornography. It was reviewing the Convention on the Rights of the Child to see how it compared with existing national law on that matter. It endorsed the work of the Special Rapporteur and would continue to provide any relevant information that was requested.

42. However, his Government rejected as completely unsubstantiated any implication that parts of babies, including their organs, were being bought and sold. It had therefore only reluctantly joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

43. Mr. ASAHI (Japan) said that he agreed with the statements of Belgium, Canada and the United States.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.42 and proposed amendments thereto as contained in document A/C.3/48/L.52

44. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.42, entitled "Human rights and terrorism", and drew its attention to the amendments proposed by Pakistan in document A/C.3/48/L.52. He said that there were no programme budget implications.

45. Mr. JAAFARI (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, although his delegation had profound reservations about the manner in which the Third Committee had politicized the important subject of human rights, it would respect the wishes of the sponsors of the draft resolution if the majority was in favour. It proposed, however, that the sponsors should accept amendment I submitted by the delegation of Pakistan, which referred to the principles enumerated in General Assembly resolution 46/51. In that way the juridical aspect would protect the political.

46. Mr. S. A. KHAN (Pakistan) said that, in the expectation that the Syrian proposal would be acceptable to all parties, his delegation withdrew document A/C.3/48/L.52.

47. Mr. BURCUOĞLU (Turkey) said that his delegation wished to consult with the other sponsors to see if the new wording would be acceptable to them, and asked that a decision on its adoption could be deferred until the next meeting.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that action would be deferred on the draft resolution to allow time for consultations.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.43

49. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.43, on alternative approaches for improving the enjoyment of human rights, and said that it had no programme budget implications.

50. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Belarus, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Estonia, Fiji, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Panama, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey.

51. The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to 36, with 20 abstentions.*

---

* The delegations of Bolivia and the Gambia subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour, the delegation of Ukraine, that it had intended to abstain.

52. Ms. FOSTIER (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the European Union, said that the Union had closely examined the draft resolution and had decided to vote against it because, in many paragraphs, both structure and content departed from the balanced formulations adopted in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action and the recommendations in that document regarding the future work of United Nations bodies in the area of human rights. The failure of the draft resolution to mention the universal nature of human rights and the European Union's rejection of the concept of conditionality were among the problems that prevented it from supporting the draft resolution. States could indeed legitimately insist that cooperation in the area of development should take fully into account the promotion and protection of human rights: the European Union attached great importance to the close relationship among human rights, democracy and development which was the basis of its policy with regard to cooperation for development.

53. Ms. ARIAS (Colombia) said that, as in previous years, her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in question because of the contribution it made towards achieving full enjoyment of human rights. But Colombia nevertheless deemed that, if a draft resolution on the issue were submitted at the following session, it should take into account the transformations that had occurred in the area of human rights in recent years, including especially the World Conference on Human Rights and the resulting Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, and should work to identify those human rights mechanisms within the United Nations system where improvement was needed.

54. Ms. LAHNALAMPI (Finland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), said that the wording of certain preambular and operative paragraphs had contributed to their decision to vote against the draft resolution in spite of their support for its general thrust. The Nordic countries deemed that the respect for human rights and the promotion of democratic processes were prerequisites for socially sustainable development and that, therefore, their allocation of development assistance was influenced by the human rights policies of recipient countries.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.44

55. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.44, entitled "Respect for the principles of national sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of States in their electoral processes", and said that it had no programme-budget implications. He reminded the Committee that the tenth preambular paragraph had been orally revised to read "Recalling its resolutions in this regard, in particular resolution 47/130 of 18 December 1992".

56. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of

Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belize, Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Fiji, Georgia, Guyana, Jamaica, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nicaragua, Paraguay, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Turkmenistan, Uruguay, Zambia.

57. The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted by 86 votes to 52, with 18 abstentions.*

58. Mr. NIETO (Argentina), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it deemed that the use of quotations from the Charter of the United Nations out of their proper context could call into question certain initiatives undertaken for the good of the international community as a whole. Since electoral assistance had been provided only at the request of interested parties, Argentina failed to understand how the principle of non-interference and sovereign equality could be evoked in that context.

59. Ms. FOSTIER (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that it had decided to vote against the draft resolution, as it had the previous year with regard to a similar proposal, because it objected to any selective use of

---

* The delegation of Guyana subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; and the delegation of Belarus, that it had intended to vote against.

(Ms. Fostier, Belgium)

the Charter, and seriously doubted the advisability of considering a controversial draft resolution on an agenda item that was usually addressed in a spirit of cooperation. It regretted as well that the document had not taken into account the results of the Vienna Conference.

60. The European Union deemed that draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.44 could not be seen as a valuable contribution to the conduct of periodic and genuine elections. Reiterating its commitment to the Charter principles to which the draft resolution referred, the European Union stated that it opposed any and every use of that instrument to justify any denial of the right to hold free and democratic elections. Indeed, Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter addressed the issue of human rights directly, stipulating that the United Nations would promote universal respect for, and observance of, those rights without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, and that all members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization to that end.

61. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation had abstained for reasons similar to those of Argentina. In its view, the draft resolution did not contribute to the strengthening of efforts to hold free periodic elections. On the other hand, draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.55, of which Costa Rica was a sponsor, contributed to those efforts.

62. Mr. MAQUIEIRA (Chile) said that his country had abstained because a selective quote had been taken from the Charter of the United Nations which could affect not only the matter in question but other resolutions as well. In its view, the draft resolution could constrain the provision of electoral assistance.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.45

63. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.45, entitled "Strengthening of United Nations action in the human rights field through the promotion of international cooperation and the importance of non-selectivity, impartiality and objectivity", and said that it had no programme-budget implication. He reminded the Committee that a minor drafting change had been made in paragraph 6.

64. Mr. GHAFOORZAI (Afghanistan) stated that his country wished to join as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.45.

65. Ms. SILVERA (Cuba) said that Cuba also wished to co-sponsor that draft resolution.

66. The draft resolution was adopted.

67. Mr. MAQUIEIRA (Chile), speaking in explanation of position, said that his country had joined the consensus on the understanding that the principle of non-selectivity must not in any way limit the role of the United Nations human rights system with regard to countries where grave human rights violations was occurring.

68. Ms. STROM (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), said that they had joined the consensus on the draft resolution on the understanding that neither the draft resolution as a whole, nor any part of it, should be interpreted as implying that action taken for the promotion or protection of human rights could be considered as interference in the internal affairs of a State, and that, on the contrary, the promotion of universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms was an obligation undertaken by Member States under the Charter. In order to improve United Nations activities in the field of human rights, it was of paramount importance to enhance the efficiency of the Commission on Human Rights, and in particular its monetary mechanisms.

69. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her country had joined the consensus for the same reasons as had Chile and Sweden.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.46

70. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.46, entitled "United Nations year for tolerance", and said that it had no programme budget implications.

71. The draft resolution was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.47

72. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.47, entitled "Human rights education decade", and said that it had no programme-budget implications.

73. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that paragraph 4 should be revised to read: "Requests the Commission on Human Rights, in cooperation with member States, human rights treaty-monitoring bodies and appropriate bodies and appropriate non-governmental organizations, to consider proposals for a United Nations decade for human rights education, and for these proposals, to be composed by the Secretary-General into a plan of action for such a decade, to be submitted, through the Economic and Social Council, to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session for the proclamation of a decade for human rights education;".

74. Ms. SEMAFUMU (Uganda) and Mr. KASOULIDES (Cyprus) said that they wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

75. Mr. De BARROS (Secretary of the Committee) said that, in the fifth preambular paragraph, after "strata of society", the words "such as children, women, youths, persons with disabilities, the ageing, indigenous people, minorities and other groups" should be inserted.

76. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that the changes indicated by the Secretariat should be made to the fourth and not the fifth preambular paragraph.

77. Mr. LINDGREN (Brazil), supported by Mr. KUEHL (United States of America), said that the English version of the fourth preambular paragraph should read "indigenous people", rather than "peoples".

78. Mr. ROSENBERG (Ecuador), supported by Ms. ESPINOSA (Mexico) and Ms. TERRAZAS (Bolivia), suggested a drafting change in the Spanish version of the fourth preambular paragraph.

79. Mr. MAUBERT (France) asked that the expression "persons belonging to minorities" be used in the draft resolution when referring to minorities.

80. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that the sponsors accepted the suggestions made by the representatives of France and Ecuador.

81. The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.48

82. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.48, entitled "Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance", and said that it had no programme-budget implications. He recalled that the French and Spanish versions of paragraph 4 would be aligned with the English text.

83. Mr. SUAZO FERNANDEZ (Honduras) said that his delegation wished to join the sponsors.

84. The draft resolution was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.50

85. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.50, entitled "Right to development", and said that it had no programme-budget implications.

86. The draft resolution was adopted.

87. Mr. BOUBACAR (Niger) said that his delegation wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.50.

88. Mr. KUEHL (United States of America) said that, while his delegation had joined the consensus, it believed that paragraphs 3 and 4 were duplicative and would have preferred to delete one of them.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.51/Rev.1

89. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.51/Rev.1, entitled "Rape and abuse of women in the former Yugoslavia", and said that it had no programme-budget implications.

90. Mr. S. A. KHAN (Pakistan) said that the sponsors had made several changes to the text of the draft resolution. The title should be amended to read: "Rape and abuse of women in the areas of the armed conflict in the former Yugoslavia". In the thirteenth preambular paragraph, the words "where appropriate", should be inserted after "International Tribunal". In the fourteenth preambular paragraph, the words "and compensation" should be deleted. In paragraph 9, after the words "in particular", the word "in" should be deleted. Finally, in paragraph 10, the word "Determines" should be replaced by "Declares".

91. He said that, as a result of those revisions, a number of countries had joined the sponsors, namely, the countries of the European Union: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom; four of the Nordic countries: Sweden, Norway, Finland and Iceland; the United States and Oman.

92. The CHAIRMAN said that the following countries had also asked to join the sponsors: Andorra, Austria, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bolivia, Cambodia, Canada, the Gambia, Georgia, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Peru, the Philippines, Rwanda, San Marino, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Ukraine and Uruguay.

93. The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted.

94. Ms. MURUGESAN (India), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution since India had always strongly condemned "ethnic cleansing" and the rape and abuse of women irrespective of the parties who committed those crimes. However, it was surprised that the text had made reference only to one particular group as having committed the crimes of rape and abuse of women.

95. The European Community's reports to the Security Council had stated that sexual crimes were not confined to any particular nationality, although in Bosnia and Herzegovina Muslim women had formed the vast majority of rape victims. Perpetrators of heinous crimes should be brought to justice irrespective of their nationality. The condemnation of only one particular group or nationality in the draft resolution did not serve the cause of justice.

96. Mr. SACIRBEY (Bosnia and Herzegovina) pointed out that the party most responsible for using rape as a policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina was the Serbian party.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.55

97. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.55, entitled "Enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of periodic and genuine elections", and said that a recorded vote had been requested on paragraphs 3 and 4 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Statements in explanation of vote before the voting

98. Mr. FERNÁNDEZ PALACIO (Cuba), said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.55.

99. The Secretariat had no right to judge the electoral process of Member States, which were solely responsible for their own political systems. The United Nations must limit itself to providing whatever assistance was requested.

100. The United Nations did not have the right or the authority to monitor the political institutions of States or to guide States in the development of such institutions under the pretext of granting electoral assistance or any other pretext.

101. Paragraphs 3 and 4, which were included for the first time in a draft resolution on the subject, were aimed at making the United Nations unit for electoral assistance into an instrument of political interference and ideological influence in States that requested electoral assistance.

102. The guidelines mentioned in paragraph 10 had not yet been considered or adopted by the Member States and came within the purview of the Third Committee. It was the tenets of draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.55 that had caused Cuba to maintain its sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.44, which had been adopted earlier.

103. Mr. LIEU Zhenmin (China) said that elections constituted an internal affair of a State. Under the Charter, the United Nations was not mandated to involve itself in such matters, although under certain circumstances the United Nations could play a role. While China respected the wishes of some States for electoral assistance, the draft overemphasized the role of the United Nations both before and after elections and that might get the Organization excessively involved in the internal affairs of States.

104. When General Assembly resolution 46/137 had been adopted, a number of countries had expressed reservations about the designated focal point. Moreover, at the time of the adoption of resolution 47/138, a number of Member States had expressed strong views concerning the establishment of the Electoral Assistance Unit by the Secretary-General without full prior consultations. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.55 went even further by referring to the dispatch of needs-assessment missions both before and after elections. Such new mechanisms and practices went beyond not only the scope of electoral assistance but also the mandate of the General Assembly. In view of that, his delegation would vote against paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution. In providing electoral assistance at the request of Member States, the United Nations should strictly

(Mr. Lieu Zhenmin, China)

abide by the Charter, respect their sovereign rights and refrain from interfering in their internal affairs.

105. Mr. KUEHL (United States of America), speaking as a principal sponsor of the draft resolution, said that paragraphs 3 and 4 had been based on paragraphs 59 and 60 and paragraph 54, respectively, of the Secretary-General's report (A/48/590). He urged Member States to follow the Secretary-General's recommendations by voting in favour of the draft resolution.

106. Mr. FERNÁNDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba), speaking on a point of order, said that no sponsors could explain their vote or make any reference to changes in a text immediately prior to a vote on a draft resolution.

107. Mr. SEDLÁK (Slovakia) said that his delegation wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

108. A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iraq, Myanmar.

Abstaining: Djibouti, El Salvador, Fiji, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Malaysia, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Uganda, Viet Nam.

109. Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution was adopted by 129 votes to 5, with 13 abstentions.

110. A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iraq, Myanmar.

Abstaining: Djibouti, El Salvador, Fiji, Guinea, Honduras, Lesotho, Malaysia, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Uganda, Viet Nam.

111. Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was adopted by 129 votes to 5, with 14 abstentions.

112. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria,

Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Cuba.

Abstaining: China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, El Salvador, Fiji, Iraq, Myanmar, Namibia, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

113. The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 138 votes to 1, with 15 abstentions.*

114. Mr. MUCH (Germany) said that his country wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.56

115. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.56, entitled "Strengthening of the rule of law". He had been informed that Andorra, Belarus, Bolivia, Cambodia, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, the Republic of Moldova, Morocco,

---

* The delegation of Cameroon subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour, but its vote had not been recorded.

(The Chairman)

Nepal, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, Portugal, Samoa, the Sudan, Togo, Uganda and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

116. The draft resolution was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.57

117. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.57, entitled "Situation of human rights in Iraq", and said that a recorded vote had been requested.

118. Mr. AL-DOURI (Iraq), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the draft resolution was based on fabricated facts. The United States and some European countries were seeking, through the Special Rapporteur, to use the issue of human rights to try to "convict" Iraq. They had even gone as far as to threaten some Member States. The Third Committee had become a political forum and not one for useful discussions on human rights. Iraq did not have control over the region of Kurdistan. The sponsors of the draft resolution were fully aware that allegations of bombings and internal siege were totally false. Unfortunately, the distribution of food and rations in Kurdistan was controlled by local militias and not by the Government.

119. The Special Rapporteur was a blatant liar who had used the term "indigenous population of southern Iraq" and altered his words later after his ignorance of the peoples and ethnic communities in the area had been exposed. He was now trying to divide Iraq along sectarian lines after failing in his attempt to divide it along ethnic and racial lines, and had made baseless allegations about the use of chemical weapons. The lack of objectivity and ill will on the part of the Special Rapporteur were obvious. He was playing a game of international politics and providing misleading information culled from sources hostile to Iraq.

120. It was ridiculous to believe that Iraq, which had been subjected to an illegal economic embargo for three years, could violate the economic rights of its own people. Everyone knew that the Iraqi Government was doing the wellnigh impossible to distribute food and clothing to its people. The facts were being distorted by the Special Rapporteur, the European countries and the United States. If the Special Rapporteur were objective and truly felt sympathy for the Iraqi people, he would have referred to the grave impact that the embargo had on human rights in Iraq. He was, on the contrary, calling for the implementation of political decisions that affected the hard-won sovereignty and independence of Iraq. The dispatch of human rights monitors to Iraq would constitute a violation of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. He urged all States to vote against the draft resolution.

121. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Iraq, Sudan.

Abstaining: Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, El Salvador, Fiji, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

122. The draft resolution was adopted by 105 votes to 2, with 41 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.